

Remarks

Claims 1-11 are pending in the application. Claim 7 has been amended. New claims 12-25 have been added to the application. The specification has been amended.

Reconsideration and re-examination of the application is respectfully requested for the reasons set forth herein.

1. The specification has been amended to correct a grammatical and typographical errors. Approval of the amendments to the specification by the Examiner is respectfully requested.

2. The Examiner has rejected claims 1-5 and 7-10 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Adachi et al. (US Patent No. 5,699,132).

a. With regard to claim 1, the Examiner stated that Adachi et al. discloses a mounting apparatus for a cathode-ray tube. A band portion 12a extends around a periphery of the cathode-ray tube. A plurality of mounting lugs 13a extend outward from the band portion 12a and are integrally formed with the band portion 12a. The mounting lugs 13a have a tapered surface 13c along a width dimension. A bezel 30 has a plurality of mounting lug receiving recesses 33 having an inner contour that is complementary to the surface profile of each mounting lug 13a.

Claim 1 recites that the mounting apparatus comprises a shellbond frame, a plurality of mounting lugs being integrally formed with the shellbond frame, and a bezel having a plurality of mounting lug receiving recesses each receiving a respective mounting lug. Adachi et al. teaches a cathode-ray tube 20 enclosed in a front cabinet 10 and a back cabinet 30. A metal rim band 23 wraps around the cathode-ray tube 20 and has metal mounting lugs 24 with holes 25 extending therefrom. The front cabinet 10 has front bosses 13 with elongate

members 13c that extend backward through the holes 25 in the lugs 24 that are received in back bosses 33 of the back cabinet 30 to secure the cathode-ray tube 20 to the front and back cabinets 10, 30.

The Examiner reads the front cabinet 10 of Adachi et al. as a shellbond frame and the back cabinet 30 as a bezel. As is known in the art and discussed on page 1, lines 10-17 and page 4, lines 5-6 of the specification, a shellbond frame is an implosion protection device that is an alternative for a tension band. The front cabinet 10 of Adachi et al., therefore, is not a shellbond frame. The front cabinet 10 of Adachi et al. is a portion of a cabinet to which the cathode-ray tube 20 is mounted. Because the front cabinet 10 of Adachi et al. is not a shellbond frame, Adachi et al. does not teach a shellbond frame having a plurality of integrally formed mounting lugs extending therefrom. Adachi et al., therefore, does not teach all the elements of amended claim 1. Removal of the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) is respectfully requested.

Claims 2-5 depend from independent claim 1. As previously discussed, Adachi et al. does not teach all the elements of amended claim 1. Because Adachi et al. does not teach all the elements of claim 1, Adachi et al. does not teach all the elements of claims 2-5. Removal of the rejection of claims 2-5 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) is respectfully requested.

b. With regard to claim 7, the Examiner stated that Adachi et al. discloses a cathode-ray tube cabinet. A band portion 12a extends around the periphery of the cathode-ray tube. A mounting lug 13 extends outward from the band portion 12a and is integrally formed with the band portion 12a. The mounting lug 13 has a tapered surface 13a along a width dimension. The Examiner, therefore, concluded that Adachi et al. teaches all the elements of claim 7.

Claim 7 has been amended to recite that the shellbond frame comprises a molded implosion protection band portion extending around a peripheral side wall of a face-plate

panel between the face-plate panel and a funnel of the cathode-ray tube, and at least one mounting lug being integrally molded with the band portion. As previously discussed, Adachi et al. teaches a cathode-ray tube 20 enclosed in a front cabinet 10 that surrounds a front half of the cathode-ray tube 20 and a back cabinet 30 that surrounds a rear half of the cathode-ray tube 20. The front cabinet 10 is the portion of the cabinet to which the cathode-ray tube 20 is mounted. The front cabinet 10, therefore, is not a molded implosion protection band that extends around a peripheral side wall of a face-plate panel between the face-plate and a funnel of the cathode-ray tube. Adachi et al., therefore, does not teach all the elements of amended claim 7. Removal of the rejection of claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) is respectfully requested.

Claims 7-10 depend from independent claim 1. As previously discussed, Adachi et al. does not teach all the elements of amended claim 1. Because Adachi et al. does not teach all the elements of claim 1, Adachi et al. does not teach all the elements of claims 7-10. Removal of the rejection of claims 7-10 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) is respectfully requested.

3. The Examiner has rejected claims 1-11 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Chihara (US Patent No. 4,949,008).

With regard to claim 1, the Examiner stated that Chihara discloses a mounting apparatus for a cathode-ray tube. A band portion 1 extends around a periphery of the cathode-ray tube. A plurality of mounting lugs 30 extend outward from the band portion 1 and are integrally formed with the band portion 1. The mounting lugs 30 have a tapered surface along a width dimension. A bezel 7 has a plurality of mounting lug receiving recesses 7e having an inner contour which is complementary to the surface profile of each mounting lug 30. The Examiner, therefore, concluded that Chihara teaches all the elements of claim 1.

Claim 1 states that the mounting apparatus comprises a “bezel having a plurality of mounting lug receiving recesses each receiving a respective mounting lug, each mounting lug receiving recess having an inner contour which is complementary to the tapered surface profile of each mounting lug.” Chihara teaches a cathode-ray tube including an outer magnetic shield 7 shaped and structured to exteriorly cover a funnel section 1b of an envelope 1 of the cathode-ray tube. The envelope 1 has fixtures 30 that are used to secure the cathode-ray tube to a support structure fast or integral with a chassis in a television receiver set. The outer magnetic shield 7 has a plurality of cutouts 7e for the passage therethrough of the corresponding fixtures 30 when the outer magnetic shield 7 is assembled to the cathode-ray tube.

The claimed invention requires the bezel to have recesses with an inner contour, which is complementary to the tapered surface profile of each mounting lug. “Complementary” is commonly defined as “completing” or “mutually making up what is lacking.” WEBSTER’S NEW WORLD DICTIONARY 290 (2d College ed. 1982). As such, the mounting lug completes or fills up the recesses as a result of the inner contour being complementary to the tapered surface profile. The cutouts 7e, shown in Figures 7 and 12 of Chihara, are neither taught nor shown to be complementary to the surface profile of the fixtures 30. The cutouts 7e are merely provided for “the passage of the fixtures 30” (column 5, lines 63-64). Additionally, the Examiner reads the magnetic shield 7 of Chihara as a bezel. As described on page 4, lines 3-4 of the specification, the bezel is defined as a front portion of a set cabinet. Because the magnetic shield 7 is not a bezel, Chihara does not teach a bezel having a plurality of mounting lug receiving recesses. Chihara, therefore, does not teach all the elements of claim 1. Removal of the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) is respectfully requested.

Claims 2-6 depend from claim 1. As previously discussed, Chihara does not teach all the elements of claim 1. Because Chihara does not teach all the elements of claim 1, Chihara does not teach all the elements of claims 2-6. Removal of the rejection of claims 2-6 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) is respectfully requested.

b. With regard to claim 7, the Examiner stated that Chihara discloses a cathode-ray tube cabinet. A band portion 1 extends around a periphery of the cathode-ray tube. A mounting lug 30 extends outward from a band portion 1 and is integrally formed with the band portion 1. The mounting lug 30 has a tapered surface along a width dimension. The Examiner, therefore, concluded that Chihara teaches all the elements of claim 7.

Claim 7 has been amended to recite that the shellbond frame comprises a molded implosion protection band portion, and at least one mounting lug being integrally molded with the band portion. Chihara teaches a cathode-ray tube having an outer magnetic shield 7 shaped and structured to exteriorly cover a funnel section 1b of an envelope 1 of the cathode-ray tube. The envelope 1 has fixtures 30 that are used to secure the cathode-ray tube to a support structure fast or integral with a chassis in a television receiver set.

Unlike the claimed invention that requires the band portion and the mounting lugs to be integrally molded, Chihara is silent as to the material and means of attachment of the fixtures 30 and the band associated therewith. Chihara, therefore, does not teach all the elements of amended claim 7 in as complete detail as set forth in the claim. Removal of the rejection of claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) is respectfully requested.

Claims 8-11 depend from independent claim 7. As previously discussed, Chihara does not teach all the elements of amended claim 7. Because Chihara does not teach all the elements of claim 7, Chihara does not teach all the elements of claims 8-11. Removal of the rejection of claims 8-11 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) is respectfully requested.

4. New claims 12-25 have been added to the application.

Claims 12-14 depend from independent claim 1. Because claim 1 is considered to be in condition for allowance for the reasons set forth herein, claims 12-14 are also considered to be in condition for allowance. Additionally, the prior art fails to teach or suggest the respective elements of claims 12-14 in combination with the elements of the corresponding base claim and any intervening claims.

Claims 16-17 depend from independent claim 7. Because claim 7 is considered to be in condition for allowance for the reasons set forth herein, claims 16-17 are also considered to be in condition for allowance. Additionally, the prior art fails to teach or suggest the respective elements of claims 16-17 in combination with the elements of the corresponding base claim and any intervening claims.

Claim 18 is considered to be in condition for allowance, because the prior art fails to teach or suggest a cathode-ray tube with a glass envelope having a tube face-plate connected to a funnel, a shellbond frame surrounding a juncture between the tube face-plate and the funnel, and a mounting apparatus for mounting the cathode-ray tube to a cabinet bezel, the mounting apparatus, comprising: a plurality of mounting lugs being integrally formed with the shellbond frame and extending outward from the shellbond frame, the mounting lugs being profiled to have a tapered surface along a width dimension; and, the bezel having a plurality of mounting lug receiving recesses each receiving a respective mounting lug, each mounting lug receiving recess having an inner contour which is complementary to the tapered surface profile of each mounting lug.

Claims 19-25 depend from independent claim 18. Because claim 18 is considered to be in condition for allowance for the reasons set forth herein, claims 19-25 are also considered to be in condition for allowance. Additionally, the prior art fails to teach or

suggest the respective elements of claims 19-25 in combination with the elements of the corresponding base claim and any intervening claims.

Examination of new claims 12-25 is respectfully requested.

In view of the amendments and arguments presented herein, the application is considered to be in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and passage to issue is respectfully requested.

Please charge the amount of **\$90.00** for the addition of five (5) independent claims in excess of twenty and any additional fees associated with this application to Deposit Order Account No. 07-0832.

Respectfully submitted,

Swank et al., Applicants



Carlos M. Herrera
Registration No. 44,762
Attorney for Applicants
Phone: 717.295.6561
Facsimile: 717.295.6084

November 11, 2003

Patent Operations
Thomson Licensing Inc.
P.O. Box 5312
Princeton, NJ 08543-5312